

Reply Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116  
Expedited Procedure  
Technology Center: 1700

Application No.: 10/721,878  
Examiner: REDDING, D.A.  
Art Unit: 1744

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the pending application is respectfully requested on the basis of the following particulars.

1. In the claims

As shown in the foregoing AMENDMENT TO THE CLAIMS, the claims have been amended to more clearly point out the subject matter for which protection is sought.

Claims 1 and 2 are amended to incorporate the allowable subject matter of originally filed claim 6. It is respectfully submitted that no new subject matter is added since the amendment merely merges the subject matter of previously submitted claims.

Claims 3, 4, 7-10, 12-14, and 16-18 are left unchanged.

Claim 5 remains canceled, and claims 6, 11, and 15 are canceled.

Entry of the AMENDMENT TO THE CLAIMS is respectfully requested in the next Office communication.

2. Allowable subject matter

The applicants gratefully acknowledge the indicated allowability of claims 12-14 and 18, and the indication of allowable subject matter in claim 6. Accordingly, the subject matter of claim 6 has been added to independent claims 1 and 2, and claims 6, 11, and 15 have been canceled. Thus, all of the remaining claims are now considered to be in condition for allowance.

The Office action indicated that the closest prior art (*Takeda*) “discloses members 29’ acting on the dust collecting unit, but clearly these are not detachably connected. Nor would it be obvious to modify these to be detachably connected, as it

would require impermissible hindsight” (page 5, item 15). As shown from the above indication, the feature from claim 6 that is added to claim 1 has already been fully considered and thus does not raise a new issue. Accordingly, the issuance of a notice of allowance is respectfully requested with respect to the remaining pending claims.

3. Rejection of claims 1-4, 9, 10, and 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. patent no. 3,591,888 (*Takeda*)

Reconsideration of this rejection is respectfully requested, in view of the amendments to claims 1 and 2, and the cancellation of claim 15, on the basis that the *Takeda* patent fails to disclose a member acting on the dust collecting unit, and the member is detachably connected to the dust removing unit, as required by amended claims 1 and 2, and as indicated to be allowable in the Office action as discussed above. The remaining claims depend from either claim 1 or 2, and are therefore patentable as containing all of the recited elements of claims 1 or 2, as well as for their respective recited features.

Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

4. Rejection of claims 16 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. patent no. 3,591,888 (*Takeda*)

Reconsideration of this rejection is respectfully requested, in view of the amendments to claims 1 and 2, from which claims 16 and 17 respectively depend, on the basis that the *Takeda* patent fails to disclose a member acting on the dust collecting unit, and the member is detachably connected to the dust removing unit, as required by amended claims 1 and 2, and as indicated to be allowable in the Office action as discussed above. Since claims 16 and 17 respectively depend from claims 1 and 2, they are also allowable as respectively requiring every element of amended claims 1 and 2.

Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Reply Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116  
Expedited Procedure  
Technology Center: 1700

Application No.: 10/721,878  
Examiner: REDDING, D.A.  
Art Unit: 1744

5. Rejection of claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. patent no. 3,591,888 (*Takeda*) in view of U.S. patent no. 3,841,067 (*Kato*)

Reconsideration of this rejection is respectfully requested, requested, in view of the amendments to claim 2, from which claim 7 depends, on the basis that the *Kato* patent fails to provide for the deficiencies of the *Takeda* patent with respect to amended claim 2, as discussed above.

Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

6. Rejection of claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. patent no. 3,591,888 (*Takeda*) in view of Japanese publication no. JP 5-192278 (*Murata et al.*)

Reconsideration of this rejection is respectfully requested, requested, in view of the amendments to claim 2, from which claim 8 depends, on the basis that the *Murata* publication fails to provide for the deficiencies of the *Takeda* patent with respect to amended claim 2, as discussed above.

Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

7. Rejection of claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Japanese publication no. JP 5-192278 (*Murata et al.*) in view of U.S. patent no. 5,035,024 (*Steiner et al.*)

This rejection is rendered moot by the cancellation of claim 11. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Reply Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116  
Expedited Procedure  
Technology Center: 1700

Application No.: 10/721,878  
Examiner: REDDING, D.A.  
Art Unit: 1744

8. Conclusion

As a result of the amendment to the claims, and further in view of the foregoing remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that every pending claim in the present application be allowed and the application be passed to issue.

If any issues remain that may be resolved by a telephone or facsimile communication with the applicants' attorney, the examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the numbers shown below.

BACON & THOMAS, PLLC  
625 Slaters Lane, Fourth Floor  
Alexandria, Virginia 22314-1176  
Phone: (703) 683-0500  
Facsimile: (703) 683-1080

Date: July 31, 2007

Respectfully submitted,



PATRICK M. BUECHNER  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 57,504